

tively, "Effervescing Solution Citrated Magnesia" and "Effervescent Granules Citrated Magnesia," which were adulterated and misbranded.

Analyses of samples of the articles made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the effervescing solution citrated magnesia contained in 100 mls 3.55 grams of citric acid, 1.56 grams of magnesium sulphate crystalline, 0.07 gram of benzoic acid, and 0.80 per cent by volume of alcohol, and that the effervescent granules citrated magnesia contained 14.78 per cent of citric acid, 32.23 per cent of tartaric acid, 11.76 per cent of sodium phosphate calculated as Na_2HPO_4 , 0.63 per cent of magnesium sulphate ($\text{MgSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$), and 0.014 per cent of saccharin.

Adulteration of the effervescing solution citrated magnesia was alleged in the information for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the tests laid down in said Pharmacopœia, official at the date of investigation of the article, in that it contained in each 100 mls 3.55 grams of citric acid, whereas said Pharmacopœia prescribes that it shall contain in each 100 mls 9.43 grams of citric acid, and in that said article contained magnesium sulphate, alcohol, and benzoic acid, which are not mentioned in said Pharmacopœia as ingredients of solution of magnesium citrate, and the standard of the strength, quality, and purity of the article was not declared on the container thereof.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the name of another article.

Adulteration of the effervescent granules citrated magnesia was alleged for the reason that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, in that it was a mixture composed in part of tartaric acid and sodium phosphate prepared in imitation of citrated magnesia and was offered for sale and sold under the name of another article, to wit, citrated magnesia.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the name of, another article, and for the further reason that the statement, to wit, "Effervescent Granules Citrated Magnesia, a preparation of Magnesium Sulphate with an effervescent base," borne on the labels attached to the bottles containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading, in that it represented that the article was citrated magnesia with an effervescent base, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not citrated magnesia, but was a product composed in part of tartaric acid and sodium phosphate.

On April 21, 1920, the defendant H. D. Brewer entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$50. A nolle prosequi was entered as to the defendant Avery Brewer.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7535. Adulteration and misbranding of Laxa-Cura Water. U. S. * * *
v. Laxa-Cura Water Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100.
(F. & D. No. 11047. I. S. No. 14778-r.)

On October 10, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the Laxa-Cura Water Co., a corporation, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on October 3, 1918, from the State of New York into the State of New Jersey, of a quantity of an article, labeled in part "Laxa-Cura Water," which was adulterated and misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article made in the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

| <i>Radical.</i> | <i>Grams per liter.</i> | <i>Hypothetical combinations.</i> | <i>Grams per liter.</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Chlorid (Cl)----- | 1.134 | Sodium chlorid (NaCl)----- | 1.869 |
| Sulphate (SO ₄)----- | 47.080 | Sodium sulphate (Na ₂ SO ₄)--- | 30.480 |
| Bicarbonate (HCO ₃)----- | .000 | Magnesium sulphate (MgSO ₄)-- | 32.870 |
| Sodium (Na) (by difference)--- | 10.604 | Calcium sulphate (CaSO ₄)---- | .339 |
| Magnesium (Mg)----- | 6.640 | | |
| Calcium (Ca)----- | .100 | | |
| | <hr/> | | <hr/> |
| | 65.558 | | 65.558 |

Bacteriological examination of 8 bottles showed the following results: Maximum count of bacteria per cc.: At 20° C., 440,000; at 37° C., 1,000,000. *B. coli*: In 10 cc., 8 bottles; in 1 cc., 4 bottles; in 0.1 cc., 2 bottles.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid animal and vegetable substance.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement borne on the label, to wit, "Analysis—Parts per 1,000 Sodium Sulphate 55.2, Magnesium Sulphate 55.2, Sodium Chloride 2.1," was false and misleading in that it represented to purchasers thereof that each unit of the same contained not less than 55.2 parts for each thousand of sodium sulphate and the same proportion of magnesium sulphate, and 2.1 parts for each thousand of sodium chlorid, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchasers into the belief that it contained a proportion of 55.2 parts of sodium sulphate, 55.2 parts of magnesium sulphate, and 2.1 parts of sodium chlorid in each one thousand parts of the article, whereas, in truth and in fact, it contained less than the above-mentioned proportions of said substances, and for the further reason that the following statement borne on the label, to wit, "A Concentrated Saline Purgative Water," was false and misleading in that it represented to purchasers that the article was a natural mineral water, whereas, in fact and in truth, it was not, but was an artificial mineral water. It was alleged in substance that the article was misbranded for the further reason that certain statements appearing on the labels of the bottles falsely and fraudulently represented it as a remedy, treatment, and cure for diseases of the kidneys, liver, and stomach, for piles, obesity, blood, and skin affections, rheumatism, gout, malaria, all kinds of stomach disorders, intestinal indigestion, and paresis, and for dysentery, when, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On October 15, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$100.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

7536. Misbranding of Reuter's Little Pills for the Liver. U. S. * * * v. Barclay & Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 11128. I. S. No. 17003-r.)

On January 3, 1920, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Barclay & Co., a corporation, doing business at New York, N. Y., alleging ship-